

Remarks

Applicant's respectfully request entry of this amendment. The following are applicant's response to issues raised in the Office Action.

Drawing Objection:

Figure 1 was objected to as missing the legend, "Prior Art". A replacement figure 1 is included with this response including the legend "Prior Art". Withdrawal of the drawing objection is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter:

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the allowance of claims 16-22. Claims 4, 8 and 11 were indicated as being allowable if re-written in independent form.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103:

Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 10, 13, 13 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Brooks (US 6,329,890). Brooks discloses a modular thin film distributed filter.

Claims 2, 5, 9 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brooks in view of Ralph (US 6,819,202). Ralph discloses a power splitter having counter rotating circuit lines.

Neither Brooks nor Ralph teach, disclose or suggest, as in amended independent claim 1, a power splitter that includes conductive vias that extend between

several layers to connect between the capacitor, inductors formed by first and second circuit lines on several layers and the terminals.

Since, the cited references do not show or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention, it is respectfully requested that the 102 and 103 rejection be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2, 3, 5 and 6 depend from independent claim 1 and add additional patentable features and are allowable therewith.

Neither Brooks nor Ralph teach, disclose or suggest, as in amended independent claim 7, a power splitter that includes an input port and the first and second output ports located on the second outer surface of a multi-layered dielectric ceramic substrate. The power splitter further includes conductive vias that extend between several layers to connect between the capacitor, the first circuit lines, the second circuit lines and the terminals.

Since, the cited references do not show or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention, it is respectfully requested that the 102 and 103 rejection be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 9-15 depend from independent claim 7 and add additional patentable features and are allowable therewith.

Conclusion:

In view of the current amendments and remarks, the claims are now believed to be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,


Kevin Redmond
Reg. No. 27,049

- **Amendments to the Drawings:**

Please replace Figure 1 with the enclosed replacement Figure 1.